



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in chapter viii ("Literature") and a number of additions to the bibliographies. In chapter ix there are some minor alterations in the article on epigraphy; references to Sandys' Latin *Epigraphy* have been inserted throughout and the bibliography has been considerably enlarged. In the article on "Palaeography" the paragraph on the school of Tours has been revised, and the bibliography has been brought up to date. The only changes made in the rest of the volume are additions to the bibliography, except that in chapter x, section 3 (p. 846), the date of the grammarian Virgilius Maro is inserted ("probably 650," following Manitius as against Zimmer, who dates him *ca.* 460).

Three American works might well have been mentioned: page 210, W. W. Mooney, *Travel among the Ancient Romans*, page 501, F. W. Clark's dissertation (Chicago) *The Influence of Sea-Power on the History of the Roman Republic*, and page 589, Duffield Osborne's *Engraved Gems*. The statement in regard to Lord Cromer's essay (p. 409) seems out of place in a third edition; on the same page the date of Boissier's *L'Afrique romaine* still reads 1991; pages 693 and 714, Gercke-Norden's *Einleitung* should be cited in the second edition (1912); page 782, the transcription of the Leiden Pliny has been corrected to read *liber II* (i.e., V) instead of *liber u* (i.e., V). The numeral seems almost certainly *u*—the cross-stroke is more in evidence in Chatelain's reproduction; page 784, read *carthagini* for *carthagine* in the transcription of the Harley MS of Cicero's *De Oratore*; pages 845 and 848, Sandys' *History of Classical Scholarship* is cited in the second instead of the third edition; page 651, the date of Cicero's *De partitione oratoria* is given as 46, though *ca.* 54 seems to be the date now generally accepted.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

CHARLES H. BEESON

Aristotle. On Coming-to-Be and Passing-Away (De Generatione et Corruptione). A Revised Text, with Introduction and Commentary. By HAROLD H. JOACHIM. Oxford University Press; American Branch. 9.70.

This, like many post-war books, has a long and interesting history. Professor Joachim's chair is Logic. He is not a professional philologist, but his study of this treatise began thirty years ago in the Oxford Aristotelian Society, under the guidance of Bywater. Returning to the subject in 1910 with a view to preparing a translation for the series edited by Mr. Ross, he found that no mere translation would make this obscure work intelligible to modern readers, and so undertook this commentary which was completed in 1915, and now at last is published with acknowledgments to many Oxford and other scholars who have assisted him with counsel, or with the loan or collations of manuscripts. And so that *rara avis*, the Aristotelian specialist, has one more excellent English edition of a fundamental Aristotelian treatise to place at his "beddes head" on the shelf of "Aristotle and his philosophie."

Interpretation led Professor Joachim against his will into text criticism. The only American equipped to follow him here is a Mr. F. H. Fobes, editor of *Aristotle's Meteorologica*,¹ whose preliminary study of certain manuscripts of the *Meteorology* he quotes for a description of J. = *Vindobonensis*. *Phil. Graec.* 100. Professor Joachim has collated photographs of six manuscripts, EFHLJ, and D^b, and made use of Philoponus, the old Latin translations, and the rare commentaries of Zabarella. His apparatus criticus appears to be, as he thinks it, fuller and more reliable than that of the Berlin edition, or the Teubner text by Prantl. In 314 a 24, however, *ἐναντίως δὲ φαίνονται λέγοντες οἱ περὶ Ἀναξαγόραν τοῖς περὶ Ἐμπεδοκλέα*, I think he is mistaken in reading with EJ, *γάρ* for *δέ*. By the assumption of a long parenthesis he refers the *γάρ* back to the statement eight lines above that Empedocles has six elements and Anaxagoras and Democritus assume an infinity. But that is confirmed by the *γάρ* of 314 a 19, at the beginning of Mr. Joachim's parenthesis. The parenthesis, if parenthesis there be, is rather our later sentence, that digresses to point out an alleged diametrical opposition between Anaxagoras and Empedocles, and *δέ* properly introduces this obiter dictum, as it does in *De Caelo* 302 a, 28.

Mr. Joachim's text presents few emendations. In 317 a 11 he accepts T. W. Allen's *οὐκ ἔστι δέ for οὐχὶ δέ*. In 320 b 1, he excises *ἥ* before *οἶον*. In 322 a 19, he adds, after *χείρ*, *ἥ βραχίον*. In 322 a 28 and 30, he reads *αὐλός* for *ἄυλος*, excising *ἄνευ ὕλης* in 28. In 325 a 5, he reads *διηρημένα for διωρισμένα*. In 325 b 28, he excises *τῶν ἀδιαιρέτων, στερεῶν, ἕκαστον*. In 328 a 26 he accepts Ross's conjecture *οὐδὲ for οὐτε*. In 334 a 9, he inserts *γε* before *ἐστίν*, and in 334 a 35, *τὸ* before *ἐκ*. In 337 b 36, he reads *τοδί for τόδε*.

A lucid introduction sets forth in Aristotle's own terminology Aristotle's conception of a science, and explains the place of this treatise in his system and in his writings on natural philosophy. The bibliography cites Apelt, Baümker, Jaeger, Zeller, Gilbert, Burnet. Professor Heide's "Qualitative Change in Pre-Socratic Philosophy," *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* (1906), which he does not seem to know, would have been much more pertinent than some of these, as, e.g., Jaeger.

The commentary deals directly with the interpretation of the text, and the elucidation of the meaning, and is not, like so many of the older editions of Aristotelian treatises, overloaded with disquisitions on synonyms and terminology which anyone can construct for himself with the aid of Bonitz' index. It evades no problems, and is especially helpful in the clear and full analyses of the arguments that precede all difficult passages. Professor Joachim's interpretations are usually right. But there is one which, unless I misunderstand him, is very surprising. On page 105 Professor Joachim writes, "The familiar Aristotelian formula *ἔστι μὲν τὸ αὐτὸ, τὸ δ' εἶναι οὐ τὸ*

¹ Harvard University Press, 1919.

$\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}$ is used to express that A and B are materially (potentially or abstractly considered) identical, but formally (actually or concretely considered) different." Either this is a complete misapprehension or Professor Joachim expects the reader to adopt without warning the Hegelian misuse of "abstract" and "concrete," which is not mentioned in the Century Dictionary or in the ordinary histories of philosophy. In fact the Aristotelian formula applies to things identical in the concrete, but distinguishable in thought. It differs very little from the distinction correctly interpreted by Professor Joachim between things numerically one and $\tau\acute{\omega}$ λόγῳ (320 b 14). The *einai* is the definition of this abstract difference. Professor Joachim's interpretation would imply that Aristotle had consciously and unequivocally gone over to Platonism. For the rest the meaning of $\tau\acute{o}$ δ' εἶναι οὐ τὸ αὐτό is explained in the English translation of Zeller's *Aristotle*, I, 217 ff., and Professor R. D. Hicks, on *De Anima*, 424 a 25, uses "concrete" correctly in this connection, as he does "abstract" in his translation of *De Anima*, 426 a 16. Some other doubtful points and supplementary matters are discussed in a preceding article.

PAUL SHOREY

New Chapters in Greek Literature. Edited by J. U. POWELL and E. A. BARBER. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921.

The purpose of this volume is to give some account of "recent discoveries in Greek poetry and prose of the fourth and following centuries B.C." It is divided into seven sections, the "Moralists," "Lyric Poetry," "Comedy," "Elegiac and Epic Writers," the "Mime," "History and Biography," and "Oratory"; and the different topics are dealt with by a group of eleven scholars. The Preface informs us that a revised text of most of the discoveries mentioned in the first and second sections of the Table of Contents is ready for the press.

Quite apart from the discussions of the newly discovered fragments, which are ably and carefully written, the book is useful for the bibliographical material which it contains (see especially pp. 29 and 40). E. M. Walker, who contributes the section on the "Oxyrhynchus Historian," decides definitely in favor of the authorship of Ephorus, and there can be little doubt that his contention is right. Professor R. J. Bonner's article on the "Four Senates of the Boeotians" (*Class. Phil.*, October, 1915), which has not yet been answered, should have been included in the bibliography. The new Headlam-Knox edition of Herondas is a timely answer to the hitherto merited reproach that English scholarship has paid scant attention to the work of this author. The scholars who contribute the different chapters have made good use of the results of German research, fully acknowledging